

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/577,468	MRONGA ET AL.	
	Examiner Jerry A. Lorendo	Art Unit 1755	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jerry A. Lorendo. (3) Jay Rowe.

(2) Pegah Parvini. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 14 November 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: Applicant provided two metallic substrates, one (Exhibit A) coated with a paint comprising the inventive pigment and the other (Exhibit B) comprising a pigment of the prior art.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-10 and new claim 11.

Identification of prior art discussed: 2003/0051634 to Takahashi and 2006/0058419 to Nagano and 6596070 to Schmidt et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


J.A. LORENDO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant's representative discussed the recently filed claim amendments of 11/13/2007 and particularly the limiting of the transitional phrase of comprising to consisting essentially of. The applicant argued that this amendment would serve to avoid the application of the references (particularly that to Takahashi) as Takahashi's platelet requires two coating layers, wherein the instantly claimed pigment platelets are limited to only one. The applicant's representative also submitted two exhibits (attached and to be held in an artifact folder) as described above to demonstrate the differences exhibited by the pigment of the instant invention as opposed to that of the prior art. The examiner's indicated that these claim amendments would be considered in view of the prior art or record and a further search. .